

1990

Occupational Paths and Prestige Levels of Sociology Concentrators: Do Gender Differences Exist?

Bonnie Lynn Reenstra
College of William & Mary - Arts & Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Reenstra, Bonnie Lynn, "Occupational Paths and Prestige Levels of Sociology Concentrators: Do Gender Differences Exist?" (1990). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1539625643.
<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21220/s2-kwn7-7782>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

Occupational Paths and Prestige Levels of
Sociology Concentrators:
Do gender differences exist?

A Thesis

Presented to

The faculty of the Department of Sociology
The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

by

Bonnie L. Reenstra

1990

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Bonnie Lynn Reenstra

Approved, August 1990

Gary A. Kreps

Gary A. Kreps, Chair

Satoshi Ito

Satoshi Ito

David P. Aday

David P. Aday

To Mom, Dad and Suzanne

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	2
CHAPTER I. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
CHAPTER II. METHODS AND RESEARCH DESIGN	19
CHAPTER III. FINDINGS.....	30
A. Occupational sex segregation.....	30
B. Occupational paths and prestige levels.....	40
C. Gender differences in occupational paths and prestige levels.....	42
D. Regression analysis: Present Occupational Prestige (PRES1) and Occupational Mobility (PRESDIFF)	45
1. number of years since graduation.....	50
2. educational attainment.....	51
3. marital status.....	52
4. number of children.....	53
5. total number of jobs.....	53
6. prestige difference.....	54
7. relationship of occupational status5 and prestige to sex of job holder.....	55
E. Discussion of findings.....	56
CHAPTER IV CONCLUSION.....	62
APPENDIX.....	64
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	87

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. David Aday, Dr. Satoshi Ito and Dr. Gary Kreps, my thesis committee advisors, for sharing their time, energies and knowledge with me during this endeavor. It is their guidance that has kept me on the "right track" while completing my research.

I also wish to extend a note of thanks to my family and friends for the patience, support and encouragement that they have given me throughout this past year.

LIST OF TABLES

1.	TABLE 1: Occupational frequency listing for current job; men and women.....	31
2.	TABLE 2: Occupational frequency listing for current job; women.....	32
3.	TABLE 3: Occupational frequency listing for current job; men.....	33
4.	TABLE 4: Regression analysis for present occupation.....	47
5.	TABLE 5: Regression analysis for prestige difference.....	48
6.	TABLE 6: Regression analysis for most recent prestige ranked occupation held.....	49

LIST OF APPENDIXES

A. Sociology assessment codebook.....	64
B. Sociology department survey questionnaire.....	82

ABSTRACT

This research was designed to examine the career paths and occupational prestige levels of William and Mary sociology graduates, with specific attention given to gender differences that might emerge. The findings for the sample population were compared to those for the general population in the United States.

Data were collected in the form of a survey questionnaire. Surveys were mailed to those who graduated with a degree in sociology at the College of William and Mary in Virginia between 1968 and 1988. The SPSS-X statistical analysis program was utilized for data analysis.

The findings from this research indicate that the graduates are engaged in a variety of occupations with diverse prestige rankings, and they are upwardly mobile. A high percentage of the graduates have pursued post-graduate coursework and degrees. The level of educational attainment, total number of years since graduation, prestige difference (from initial to most recent employment), and employment status, were found to be significant in accounting for some of the variance in one's current prestige level. Marital status was revealed to be a more important variable for men than for women. This finding was contradictory to those of the general population. Consistent with findings for the general population was the strong predictive power of education.

There are gender differences amongst the graduates, as uncovered by an analysis of occupational sex segregation and separate regression outputs and frequency tables. Findings show that although men and women have similar prestige scores, they are not engaged in the same occupational activities. This is also true of the general population. Overall, the findings indicate that while there is some degree of similarity between sociology graduates and the general population, there are also some interesting differences between them.

Occupational Paths and Prestige Levels of
Sociology Concentrators:
Do gender differences exist?

INTRODUCTION

Sociologists increasingly have become interested in examining gender similarities and differences in studies of the overall career paths of both men and women. At least in part, the interest in this topic has increased because of the steady rise in the number of women participating in the labor force. Their respective participation rates for 1950, 1978, and 1980 are 33.9%, 50.0% and 51.2% (Larwood and Gutek 1984: 237). There were approximately 50 million working women in the United States in 1984. This number accounts for 43% of the total labor force population (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 1). The increases in participation rates are attributed to the influx of both single and married females. A large number of those who have entered the labor force are women with small children. In 1950 only 12% of the women with children under the age of six were in the labor force, compared with 52.1% in 1980 (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 3).

Prior to 1970, sociological studies were concerned primarily with the examination of the intergenerational transmission of advantage between father and son. With the significant increase in female labor force participation rates on all levels, researchers have begun to compare the status attainment processes of both men and women (Jacobs 1989: 33).

This work is an examination of the career paths and prestige levels of 1968-1988 male and female William and Mary sociology graduates. The alumni survey that was administered in the spring of 1989, by the Department of Sociology at the College, is the source of data for my research. I have attempted to uncover the similarities and differences that exist between the attainment levels of the aforementioned surveyed individuals. In so doing, I examined each respondent's year of graduation, employment status, highest level of educational attainment, marital status, number of children, and of course, gender. My hope was to identify correlations between the above mentioned variables and the individual's prestige level and occupational attainment. The specific alumni survey questions that pertain to the line of inquiry that I have taken in my research are as follows:

When did you graduate from William and Mary?
Are you Currently employed? Job descriptions.
Please summarize your employment history since
graduation.

What are your employment plans for the future?
Have you pursued any post-graduate education?
Are you currently -married, widowed, divorced,
separated, or have you never been married?

Do you have any children? How many and what are their
ages?

What is your gender?

The remainder of this paper will include a discussion of the relevant literature that is available and relevant to my research, followed by a detailed description of my data base and research design. The final portion of this paper is a discussion of my research findings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The United States Bureau of the Census is one source of data which sociologists have been using to identify similarities and differences between male and female labor force participants. It has been found that half of all the female workers are located in 21 occupations, while half of all male workers are spread out into 65 occupations (Larwood and Gutek 1984: 240). Clearly there are differences in the occupational opportunities and choices for women as opposed to men.

Larwood and Gutek assert that women have limited opportunities for upward mobility within occupations and across occupations. This pattern has been termed a "short career ladder" (1984: 241-2). Larwood and Gutek continue by arguing that women's jobs do not have clear career paths with room for attaining high levels of occupational status and earnings, while the male dominated occupations provide multiple ways for achieving high occupational status and earnings (1984: 242). In a related fashion, Roos acknowledges that there is substantial occupational segregation, asserting that such segregation will continue even though a minority of women have been moving into what traditionally has been labeled as "men's work" (1985: 38).

Research conducted by Reskin and Hartmann in the area of occupational sex segregation supports the assertions of Roos. Reskin and Hartmann have found the degree of male and female occupational sex segregation to have been quite stable since about 1900 (1986: 1). However, it is important to note that a slight decrease in segregation did occur in the 1970's (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 23). With the increases in women's labor force participation and sporadic minor decreases in sex segregation, one is led to believe that the occupational opportunities for women are broadening. This is not happening as much as one would expect. Certain fields have become more integrated, but the fastest growing fields are those that are the most segregated. The decreases that have occurred are a result of men moving into what have traditionally been referred to as "women's occupations" and a small proportion of women increasing their representation in some of male dominated fields. Some of the segregated occupations have also shrunk in overall size, further indicating a reduction in segregation. Female labor force participation rates have dramatically increased, but many of the women who have entered the labor force have entered into fields which are already dominated by females, merely serving to further promote segregation (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 26).

Edward Gross notes two additional phenomena which have taken place in the "world of work", and have served to promote sex segregation. The first is the creation of

entirely new fields which have become dominated by the female portion of the labor force. The second is a basic structural change which has occurred within some occupations. This structural change takes the form of invasion and succession. An occupation that was formally dominated by one sex is "invaded" by and "taken over" by the opposite sex. Many positions that were once filled by men are now dominated by women (Gross 1968: 202). Historical evidence supports the structural transformation of occupations that is put forth by Gross. Prior to 1880 all clerical and sales positions were held by men, while today the majority of positions in these fields are held by women (Gross 1968; 200). Following World War II, women took over what had traditionally been the "male occupations" of bank teller, insurance adjuster, real estate agent and secretary (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 8,31). The overall degree of segregation is not altered when a structural change takes place.

Utilizing 1980 Census data, Reskin and Hartmann point out the degree to which certain occupations remain segregated and are becoming more segregated. In the United States 93% of all dentists are men (1986: 7), 84% of all elementary school teachers are women (1986: 18), 98.8% of all secretarial positions are held by women (1986: 30), 95.9% of all registered nurses are women and 72.7% of all sales workers are women (1986: 21). The proportion of women in clerical positions has grown considerably since 1970. In

1950, 77.7% of all bookkeepers were women and by 1980 that figure had risen to 93%. Other clerical positions which have experienced the same increases include billing clerks, cashiers, file clerks, keypunch operators, receptionists, legal secretaries, typists and teacher's aides (1986: 30). The movement of women into fields which are already female-intensive has slowed the decrease in segregation (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 29).

The formerly predominantly male occupations which have slowly become more integrated, due to the influx of larger proportions of women, include those of accountant, bank officer, financial manager, manager and administrative positions, janitor, lawyer, computer programmer, baker, bus driver, bartender, public relation specialists, broadcast equipment operators, protective service workers, animal caretakers, typesetters and compositors (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 29). To be specific, female representation in executive, administrative, and managerial occupations has risen 33.4% from a figure of 20.1% in 1970 to 53.5% in 1980 (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 28). The above mentioned occupations are just a representative sample of those in which the female population has grown. It is important to note that a high degree of segregation still persists in the male craft, operative and laborer occupations (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 29).

A small proportion of men have entered into the female dominated occupations of registered nurse, pre-kindergarten

and kindergarten teacher, librarian, social worker, private household cook, textile and sewing machine operators, chief communications operator and hand engraving and printing occupations (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 22, 29).

Gross makes an interesting observation in noting that when women enter into male dominated fields the men seem to leave, whereas when men enter into female dominated occupations, the women are much less likely to leave. He suggests that women should find ways to attract men to "their" jobs in order to promote integration (1968: 207)

It is hypothesized that the occupations that have become integrated will eventually experience the structural transformation discussed earlier. Reskin and Hartmann cite Greenbaum in saying that the computer field is expected to split into separate segregated specialty fields. It is predicted that women will hold the operating and some of the programming jobs, while men will hold the higher-level programming and systems analyst jobs (1986: 32). The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts that the largest rates of occupational growth will occur in many of the segregated occupations, with uncertain rates of growth occurring in the more integrated fields (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 33). It is noted that certain observers believe that as the United States' economy becomes more service oriented there will be growth in the "sex-neutral" occupations (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 33). The Bureau of Labor Statistics upholds the belief that growth will occur within those occupations that

are associated with advanced levels of technology, such as the computer fields. There are, however, individuals who feel that the Bureau has overestimated the amount of growth to take place within these fields (Reskin and Hartmann 1986: 33).

Reskin and Hartmann find that there is not enough evidence to support the predictions for further desegregation in the 1990's, and they anticipate only slight declines in comparison to the rates experienced in the 1970's (1986: 36). Although men and women have been moving into "opposite sex" occupations, it is not enough to compensate for the high levels of growth to be experienced by the sex segregated occupations. Occupational sex segregation will persist.

Treiman and Terrell have conducted extensive research on the topic of occupational prestige and have concluded that despite the existence of occupational sex segregation, the average prestige levels of men and women in the labor force are nearly identical (1975A: 181).

One part of Treiman and Terrell's research was based on 1967 data from the "Longitudinal study of labor market experiences of women" and the 1962 survey of Occupational Changes in a Generation. Both data sets were collected by the Bureau of the Census. The first data set included a representative sample of women between the ages of 30 and 44. Of the 3606 interviews that were completed of white females, only 1649 were currently employed; and of the 1477

nonwhite women, only 875 were employed. Only the employed population was to be studied. The second data set was the survey of Occupational Changes in a Generation, and it provided information on males. The researchers drew a subsample of the total population that had been studied, using only the 6759 employed white males and 539 employed nonwhite males (1975A; 175).

Treiman and Terrell compared the male and female data using the Standard International Occupational Prestige Scale. They chose to use a prestige scale rather than a socioeconomic status scale because they felt that the inter-sex correlation with respect to prestige structure was greater than the socioeconomic characteristic correlations, and would provide more accurate data for inter-sex comparisons (1975A: 176).

Results of their analysis indicate that only a few women are occupying the very highest status positions. Treiman and Terrell argue that entry into and mobility within these positions is difficult for women to obtain, but they remind readers not to generalize these restrictions to all levels of the prestige and status hierarchy (1975A: 174).

Treiman and Terrell concluded also that the processes of occupational attainment of men and women were similar and primarily based on educational attainment, and less on marital status and social origins (1975A: 182). Treiman and Terrell conclude the following:

The labor market discrimination against women doesn't extend to the status of the work open to them nor to the qualifications demanded. Women work at jobs which are about as prestigious as those held by men and, like men, secure good jobs mainly on the basis of superior education (1975A: 182)

Treiman and Terrell also found that even though men and women may have the same status and do the same work, women will earn less than men (1975A: 184). They state that "women are not able to convert their educational attainments into earnings as effectively as they can for status" (Treiman and Terrell, 1975A: 195).

McKee McClendon conducted a study of the male and female status attainment process which, in part, replicates and supports the study conducted by Treiman and Terrell. McClendon used data from the National Opinion Research Center's (NORC) 1972, 1973 and 1974 General Social Surveys (GSS). Each survey was a national sample of all the non-institutionalized individuals 18 years or older. The total number of respondents was 4,601, but he focused his analysis on the 1,381 white males and 778 white females holding full or part-time jobs (1976: 53).

McClendon believes that his data set is superior to that used by Treiman and Terrell because the GSS data had male and female data for the same years. The sample included adults 18 years and older. The data here included family background variables. And the data were more recent than Treiman and Terrell's. McClendon believed that his

study would lead to a more valid comparison of the male and female status attainment process because of the above mentioned factors (1976: 53).

The Socioeconomic Index (SEI) created by Duncan was used by McClendon to measure occupational status. He chose the SEI over a prestige scale because he wanted his findings to be comparable to other studies using the SEI that were being conducted at that time (1976: 53-4). McClendon's findings support and elaborate upon those of Treiman and Terrell with respect to the male and female prestige distribution, importance of education on status attainment, and differences based on marital status.

McClendon found that his male and female distributions on the prestige scale were similar to one another. He also found that men were more likely than women to hold positions in the occupations with the lowest and highest status ratings (1976: 55). The similar average status distributions of men and women could be partially due to the fact that women are found mostly in medium status occupations, while men hold more positions on all levels.

As in Treiman and Terrell's study, education was found to have the greatest impact on the status attainment of both men and women. McClendon attributes the female's unequal distribution within the status hierarchy to her educational attainment. He found that men were more likely to have higher levels of educational attainment as compared to women (1976: 56).

The marital status of women was also found to affect their level of status attainment. McClendon felt that married women would be constrained and unable to participate freely in the labor market, forcing them to accept positions that were not proportional to their level of education and consequently lower their status. Unmarried women would not be constrained as such, resulting in higher level of status attainment (1976: 61). The effect of number of children in the home was also studied, but no significant findings were reported (1976: 61).

Whether a woman was employed full or part time was also found to have an effect on her status attainment level. Those who were employed in full time occupations were found to have achieved a higher status level (McClendon 1976: 61-2). McClendon's overall findings supported the earlier work of Treiman and Terrell. His results indicate that education has the greatest effect on status attainment, followed by work status, marital status, and then children in the home (1976: 62).

Paula England's research on occupational prestige supports previous research that found the mean occupational prestige rating of men and women to be equal (1979: 261). She found that women were proportionally represented throughout all but the top 5% of the occupational hierarchy, but not equally represented in most occupations (1979: 260). England believed that two separate prestige ladders existed, one for males and one for females. She saw the prestige

dimension of the work world as "a pair of sex-specific yet parallel hierarchies of occupations", excluding the top ranking positions. She said that in the female hierarchy there were no positions equivalent to those top positions held by men (1979: 261).

England claimed that there was no structural resistance to the sex equality of occupational prestige except when men and women were in face-to-face contact. In cases of face-to-face encounters, she believed that the female would usually have the lower prestige (1979: 262). England also noted that despite the presence of prestige equality between men and women, women have less income and power than men. This is somewhat surprising because usually there is a positive correlation between the prestige, income, and power of an occupation (1976: 264). Intercorrelations among these variables were historically based only upon the findings of male samples.

Sewell, Hauser and Wolf studied occupational achievement levels by examining data from an 18 year follow up study of Wisconsin high school seniors. Their findings were also supportive of earlier research stating that educational level was the most effective predictor of status (1980: 575). They found that when the individuals initially entered the labor force women received a lower payoff for their education than men, but later in life the cycle reversed and women were receiving higher occupational status returns on their education than men (1980: 579).

When examining the status of the current job of the individual, Sewell, Hauser and Wolf found that it was related directly to and influenced by the individual's ability, educational attainment and status of their first job (1980: 575). Women's lack of mobility is partially attributed to the fact that women often interrupt their employment because of family obligations such as marriage and childbearing. While this provided a reasonable explanation, the authors were still unable to explain differences for those women who remained unmarried (Sewell, Hauser and Wolf 1980: 579).

Other research conducted utilizing the Wisconsin data supported the earlier findings that women are excluded from the top ranking prestige positions, even when the effects of educational attainment, level of occupational status and self-employment were held constant (Sewell, Hauser and Wolf 1980: 579-80). Patricia Roos examined the occupational prestige levels and career patterns of men and women. She found that men and women are employed in jobs of comparable prestige and status and have followed similar attainment processes, but their wage levels differ. Men receive greater economic returns than women (1985: 95, 108).

Roos is cited earlier as acknowledging the existence of a significant amount of occupational sex segregation. Here her findings on the relationship between occupational sex segregation and prestige are noted. She does not deny that men and women may have the same prestige ranking, but states

that they are doing very different tasks. Women are located in high-prestige clerical occupations, low-prestige prestige professional and technical positions, and low prestige service jobs. Men are mostly located in high and medium-prestige production work and high-prestige professional and administrative employment (1985: 95). It is obvious that there are major differences in the types of positions held by men and women in the occupational hierarchy.

Roos offers three patterns to explain the differential labor force participation of women. The first is called the Early Peak. In this pattern there is substantial labor force participation prior to the marriage and childbearing years, followed by a sharp decrease in participation. The second is the Double Peak. Here there is high participation prior to marriage and childbearing, followed by a drop during the childbearing years. An increase will occur after childbearing (before the children are grown) until a final decrease takes place. The third pattern is the Single Peak, which is similar to the pattern for males. Here there is an increase in participation until age 30 or 40 and then a tailing off, but with lower rates than men of the same age (1985: 42).

Upon examining trends in current participation data, Roos says that there is a transition taking place. Women are moving from the double peak pattern to the single peak pattern. Roos attributes this to the fact that younger

cohorts of women are staying in the labor force even during their prime childbearing years (1985: 43).

The studies cited above are testimony to the increasing interest researchers have in the occupational prestige hierarchies of men and women. The writings of these researchers have revealed the following key findings:

1. Men and women have similar prestige scores.
2. There is a high degree of occupational segregation
3. Women are under-represented at the top of the occupational hierarchy.
4. Level of educational attainment is the most accurate predictor of occupation and prestige status.
5. Marital status affects the status attainment levels of women.
6. Employment status affects the status attainment levels of women.
7. The number of children in the home does not have a significant effect on the status attainment levels of women.
8. Although men and women have similar prestige ratings, men have higher incomes.

METHODS AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The heart of my research deals with an examination of occupational sex segregation and the career paths and prestige levels of men and women. The individuals I have focused my research upon are those who graduated from the College of William and Mary with a degree in sociology between the years of 1968 and 1988.

The data that I utilized were primary data that had been collected in 1989 by the sociology department at the College. The data were collected in the form of a survey questionnaire that was mailed out to those individuals who graduated between the years of 1968 and 1988, inclusive. The year 1968 was chosen as the starting date, because that was the year when the fields of sociology and anthropology split apart and became their own unique disciplines at the College. The survey itself posed questions to the respondent regarding his or her gender, employment background, further educational plans, marital status, number of children, the sociological training as related personal and career development, and an overall evaluation of the sociology program at William and Mary.

The department had great difficulty in obtaining the names and addresses of those students who graduated during

the desired time span. The information on recent graduates was the most difficult to find. A figure of 678 was derived by the department following extensive record probing at the Alumni House and Office of the Registrar. This figure is thought to represent 90% of the total number of students who graduated during the specified time span.

Addresses were only obtainable for 610 of the 678 graduates. When the surveys were mailed out initially, some were sent back "return to sender" and two others were returned with statements indicating that the desired respondent had died. Taking these factors into account, the greatest number of possible respondents was 525. Responses were received from 287 individuals, a figure representing 42% of the total survey population and 55% of the sample frame.

The gender breakdown of responses is 60% (191) female and 40% (96) male. This figure is close to the actual gender ratio of the population of graduates, which had 58% females and 42% males. There is a response bias in terms of the year of graduation. Response rates were found to be much higher from the earlier graduates. When response rates were broken down by year into blocks representing 25% of the total number of responses, the year distribution is as follows: 1968-70, 1971-75, 1976-81 and 1982-88.

It is the survey responses received from the 287 respondents that my research is based upon.. In general I feel that the information revealed by the survey responses

is very useful in the tracing of the occupational paths and prestige levels of the sociology graduates. I do find one major fault with the survey. It neglects to retrieve any data on the income levels of the graduates. I feel that data on incomes would have been interesting to examine because previous research has shown that discrepancies exist between the wage levels of men and women who have similar occupational prestige rankings. I would have liked to examine income data to see if these discrepancies existed for sociology graduates.

A validity problem was found to exist at the outset of my research in terms of how the occupational data were being coded. As a result, I, along with Mark Bunster and Dawn Riddle, recoded respondent occupations using the NORC occupational classification system. NORC has also developed an accompanying occupational prestige scale with which to rank the prestige levels of the occupations included in the classification system. The NORC occupation and corresponding prestige codes have replaced all occupation codes previously assigned to the data. Additional codes were also created to represent those individuals who are graduate students, homemakers, trainees, and self-employed. These titles do not have accompanying prestige scores.

The NORC prestige survey is one of the major scales of occupational prestige, but it has been widely criticized. Critics of the NORC scale and other prestige scales claim that the scales don't capture gender-based inequalities that

exist within occupations (Jacobs 1989: 34). The NORC prestige survey of 1947 and the updated version of 1963 are both based on the evaluative rankings of occupations by a national random sample of respondents (Hall 1969: 267). Prestige is an evaluative judgement, and its measurement will undoubtedly vary with the objective attributes of the "rater" (Bose 1985: 5). It is impossible to get a "pure" measure of prestige. Hall states

Since prestige scales rely upon the perception of the respondents and since such perception usually involves some distortion of reality, the prestige scales themselves cannot be taken as totally accurate appraisals of the stratification system. Distortions enter the picture from the tendency of people to underrate occupations lower than their own and overrate their own occupational positions. (1969: 266)

Another of the major criticisms of the NORC survey is that it is constructed in such a way that it is biased in favor of men. The questions are said to be phrased in such a way that they imply a potential male job holder and that the occupations rated included only those typically employing men. The scale resulting from this type of survey was "a scale of male incumbents in male-dominated occupations" (Powell and Jacobs 1985: 1062).

There have been attempts to correct for the sex-bias in occupational prestige scales and to create a sex-neutral scale that was uncontaminated by the sex of the incumbent. This has been done by relying on questionnaires which

included occupations in which women predominate, and rewording the questionnaires so that neither men or women were explicitly referred to (Powell and Jacobs 1985: 1062).

Powell and Jacobs point out that just because no explicit references are made to sex doesn't mean that the measure is based on "no sex-linked assumptions". They continue by suggesting that assumptions regarding sex may be unintentionally built into the scale despite the absence of specific gender references. They also reiterate an earlier point, stating that the rankings of respondents will embody their personal prejudices and assumptions (1985: 1062).

Although it appears that there really can be no pure, gender equal measure of prestige, I feel that the NORC prestige scale has been a useful research aid. General prestige differences between occupations have been exposed by the scale and these differences have proved to be an important part of my research findings. I have utilized the prestige scores to make general gender comparisons and I believe that the controversy over the scale, as discussed above, does not imply that my overall findings have been distorted by using the scale.

After looking at the remaining variables and their coding, I found it necessary to make some additional coding changes and create a few entirely new variables in order to answer the research questions that I have put forth at the end of this section. The variables for marital status and number of children in the home were recoded. The response

categories were condensed so that the data could be more easily interpreted and manipulated. Marital status is now broken into two categories, married and not married, instead of the original five. The not married code encompasses all individuals who are widowed, separated, divorced, and never married. The original coding for number of children had separate codes for all possible responses. The number of individuals with three or more children was small, so responses of three or more are now represented by one code. There are now only four gradations representing the number of children. The categories are: no children, one child, two children, and three or more children.

An additional variable was created to simplify measurement of post-graduate education. This variable combines all possible post graduate fields of study and the level of graduate training attained in each. It has four categories; no graduate training, only coursework, a Master's degree, and a PhD or Law degree. The specific fields of study lose their identity in this new variable. Finally there are two other important variables that were created; one representing the present prestige of the respondent and the other representing the difference, positive or negative, between the prestige of the most current prestige ranked occupation and the first prestige ranked occupation.

To more fully comprehend the discussion of my research findings that is to follow, I feel that a general knowledge

of the frequency breakdowns for some of the more important variables would be useful to the reader.

In terms of the overall levels of educational attainment, there were 68 (23.7%) persons who received no graduate training, 82 persons who completed coursework (28.6%), 101 persons who received a Master's degree (35.2%), and 36 persons who obtained a PhD or Law degree (12.5%). Approximately 219 (76%) of the persons in my sample received some type of post graduate training. In looking at the gender breakdowns for this variable I find that 18 (18.8%) of the men had no graduate training, 33 (34.4%) completed coursework, 27 (28.1%) received a Master's degree, and 18 (18.8%) received a PhD or Law degree. The corresponding figures for women are as follows: 50 (26.2%) had no graduate training, 49 (25.7%) engaged in coursework, 74 (38.7%) obtained their Master's degree, and 18 (9.4%) received a PhD or Law degree.

The recoded variable for marital status shows that there are 89 unmarried persons and 197 married persons. There is also one male who did not respond to the question. A total of 69 (71%) of the men and 128 (67%) of the women are married.

The variable for the number of children indicates that 122 individuals have no children (42.5%), 53 have 1 child (18.5%), 80 have 2 children (27.9%), and 32 persons have 3 or more children (11.1%). Of the men, 37 have no children (38.5%), 19 have 1 child (19.8%), 27 have 2 children

(28.1%), and 13 have 3 or more children (13.5%). The figures for women reveal that 85 women have no children (44.5%), 34 have 1 child (17.8%), 53 have 2 children (27.7%), and 19 have 3 or more children (9.9%).

Employment status frequencies indicate that there are 201 (70.0%) persons who are employed full-time, 42 persons engaged in part-time employment (14.6%), and 44 persons who are not currently employed (15.3%). It is important to note that the category of "not employed" includes individuals who are homemakers, graduate students, and volunteer workers. It is a category that encompasses all of the persons not engaged in "paid work". The gender breakdowns for this variable reveal that 81 (84.4%) men are engaged in a full-time occupation, 5 are employed part-time (5.2%), and 10 are not currently employed (10.4%). The totals for women indicate that 120 (62.8%) of the women are employed full-time, 37 are employed part-time (19.4%), and 34 are not currently employed (17.8%).

The specific frequency outputs for some of the variables examined are lengthy and it is unnecessary to present them in their entirety, so only the mean, standard deviation and range are reported for the variables representing the total number of jobs since graduation, the total number of years since graduation, the present NORC prestige rating of the individual, and the prestige difference between most recent prestige ranked and first prestige ranked vocation.

Overall, the minimum number of total jobs held since graduation is 0, and the maximum is 13. The mean number of jobs is 3.49 and the standard deviation is 1.99. The overall figures for the total number of years since graduation reveals that the minimum number of years since graduation is 1 and the maximum is 21. The mean number of years since graduation is 12.87 and the standard deviation is 6.3. For both of these variables the figures do not vary dramatically by gender.

In my sample the lowest prestige score is 0 and the highest is 78. The overall mean prestige score is 48.27. The mean for men is 52.16 and the mean for women is 46.31. The combined standard deviation is 21.87. The standard deviation for men is 17.86 and 23.43 for women. This calculation of the mean prestige scores include the 0 prestige scores for persons not engaged in a prestige ranked activity. Unfortunately this serves to mask the actual similarity that exists between the prestige scores for men and women, because there is a high percentage of women engaged in non-prestige ranked activities. When the mean for prestige is calculated only for those individuals who are currently employed in occupations with a NORC prestige rating, the similarity in prestige scores emerges. The mean prestige score for men becomes 55.6 and the mean for women becomes 56.3. The corresponding standard deviations are 12.03 and 10.00.

The range of difference in prestige from first to most recent occupation is -28 to +57. The mean difference is 6.62. There are no significant differences in these figures for men and women. Differences do emerge when looking at the standard deviations. The overall standard deviation is 15.85, while the figure for men is 17.97 and 14.79 for women.

I believe that the information obtained by the departmental survey questionnaire , along with the prior research conducted in this field, has supplied me with a sufficient data base from which to draw some conclusions as to degree of occupational sex segregation and the career paths and occupational prestige levels of William and Mary sociology graduates.

The major research questions addressed by my study are as follows:

1. What are the occupational paths and prestige levels of William and Mary Sociology graduates?
2. Are there occupational path and prestige level differences between men and women?
3. What effect does year of graduation have on occupational status and prestige?
4. What effect does employment status have on occupational status and prestige?
5. What effect does level of educational attainment have on occupational status and prestige?

6. What effect does marital status have on occupational status and prestige?
7. What effect does the number and age of children, if any, have on occupational status and prestige?
8. Is occupational status and prestige directly related to the sex of the job holder?
9. What are the future trends for the occupational status and prestige levels of men and women as indicated by my research?

FINDINGS

Occupational Sex Segregation

My research indicates that the degree of occupational sex segregation in my sample of sociology graduates is comparable to that found in the general population. My data reveal both the integration and segregation of certain occupations. Refer to tables 1 thru 3 on pages 31 thru 33.

The sample that I am examining, as earlier elaborated upon, is comprised of a total of 287 individuals, 96 males and 191 females. A maximum of five occupations since graduation was coded for each individual. In looking at the complete listing of occupations for each respondent I discovered that out of the 442 NORC occupational codes, 123 or 27.8% of the total number of occupations listed are represented by my sample. Males represent 87 or 70.3% of the 123 occupations, while the females represent 90 or 73.2% of the occupations.

The female sample is more than twice the size of the male population and yet, in looking at the occupational frequency totals above, they are found to be represented in only three additional occupations compared to the male population. The average number of jobs held since graduation for both men and women is 3.8, so the difference

TABLE 1
OCCUPATIONAL FREQUENCY LISTING FOR CURRENT JOB
MEN AND WOMEN

OCCUPATION	FREQUENCY	PRESTIGE	PERCENT
Accountant	3	57	1.0
Computer programmer	3	51	1.0
Computer specialists	3	51	1.0
Lawyers	13	76	4.5
Librarian	2	55	.7
Operations & systems researchers & analysts	11	51	3.8
Personnel & labor relations workers	3	56	1.0
Registered nurses	2	62	.7
Psychologists	5	71	1.7
Social workers	22	52	7.7
Sociology teachers	8	78	2.8
Elementary school teachers	3	60	1.0
Pre-kindergarten & kindergarten teachers	5	60	1.7
Secondary school teachers	2	63	.7
Vocational & educational counselors	4	51	1.4
Public relations & publicity writers	2	41	.7
Research workers, not specified	5	51	1.7
Bank officers & financial managers	7	72	2.4
Health administrators	3	61	1.0
Office managers, nec	6	50	2.1
Officials & administrators; public administration	22	61	7.7
Sales managers & department heads, retail trade	9	50	3.1
Sales managers, except retail trade	4	50	1.4
School administrators, college	6	61	2.1
School administrators, elementary & secondary	4	60	1.4
Managers & administrators, private sector	37	50	12.9
Real estate agents & brokers	4	44	1.4
Sales representatives, wholesale	2	40	.7
Secretaries	4	46	1.4
Current members of the Armed Force	4	47	1.4
Policemen & detectives	2	48	.7
Graduate students	15	00	5.2
Homemakers	20	00	7.0
Not currently employed	4	00	1.4
Other job titles (N=1 for each)	38		13.6
	287		100.

TABLE 2
OCCUPATIONAL FREQUENCIES FOR CURRENT JOB
WOMEN

OCCUPATION	FREQUENCY	PRESTIGE	PERCENT
Accountant	2	57	1.1
Computer programmer	2	51	1.1
Lawyers	9	76	4.8
Operations & systems researchers	5	51	2.7
Personnel and labor relation workers	3	56	1.6
Registered nurse	2	62	1.1
Psychologists	4	71	2.1
Social workers	18	52	9.6
Sociology teachers	4	78	2.1
Elementary school teachers	2	60	1.1
Pre-kindergarten & kindergarten teachers	5	60	2.7
Vocational & educational counselors	3	51	1.6
Public relations people & publicity writers	2	41	1.1
Research workers, not specified	4	51	2.1
Bank officers & financial managers	4	72	2.1
Health administrators	2	61	1.1
Office managers	6	50	3.2
Officials & administrators; public administration	16	61	8.6
Sales managers & department heads, retail trade	6	50	3.2
Sales managers, except retail trade	3	50	1.6
School administrators, college	5	61	2.7
Managers & administrators private sector	17	50	9.1
Real estate agents & brokers	4	44	2.1
Secretaries	4	46	2.1
Graduate students	10	00	5.3
Homemakers	19	00	10.2
Other job titles (N=1 for each)	30		13.9
	191		100.

TABLE 3

OCCUPATIONAL FREQUENCIES FOR CURRENT JOB

OCCUPATION	MEN	FREQUENCY	PRESTIGE	PERCENT
Computer specialists	2	51	2.1	
Lawyers	4	76	4.2	
Operations & systems researchers & analysts	6	51	6.3	
Social workers	4	52	4.2	
Sociology teachers	4	78	4.2	
Secondary school teachers	2	63	2.1	
Bank officers & financial managers	3	72	3.1	
Officials & administrators; public administration	6	61	6.3	
Sales managers, except retail trade	3	50	3.1	
Managers & administrators, private sector	20	50	20.8	
Current members of the Armed Forces	3	47	3.1	
Policemen & detectives	2	48	2.1	
Graduate students	5	00	5.1	
Other job titles (N=1 for each)	45		33.3	
	-----		-----	
	91		100.	

in the number of possible job titles is not attributable to the fact that men have held, on the average, more jobs than women.

When looking at the present occupation of each respondent, it is revealed that men and women are distributed throughout 68 or 55.3% of the 123 total occupations. There are 40 individuals, 34 females and 6 males, who are engaged in non-prestige ranked activities. Table 1 shows the combined frequency distributions for men and women for those occupations in which there are two or more persons. Separate occupational breakdowns for women and men are found in tables 2 and 3 respectively. In looking at the tables, the diversity of occupations in which sociology graduates are distributed emerges. The segregation and integration of certain occupations is also illuminated.

Women occupy a smaller number of occupational categories, in relation to their numbers, than men. The 153 women in prestige holding positions can be found in only 48 different occupations. Of that total, 70.6% of the women are in occupations in which there is at least one other woman. The men are more widely dispersed. There are 90 men, located in a total of 41 prestige ranked occupations. Only 61.6% of the men are found to occupy positions in which there is at least one other man. This unequal distribution does not fluctuate dramatically in looking back to occupation distribution figures for previously held jobs.

The number of women in the labor market has consistently been at least twice that of men and yet they have only been distributed throughout approximately 10 additional occupations. Women are found in fewer occupations than men.

In looking at the specific occupational categories that men and women occupy, I find that male and female sociology graduates are distributed in much the same way as the general population. The range of occupations that my sample represents is quite diverse, considering the degree of homogeneity amongst them. I attribute much of the diversity to further education and graduate degrees in a variety of fields other than sociology. I also speculate that an individual's personal characteristics and attributes will influence his or her occupational choice.

Analysis of occupational frequencies and diversity by gender, as depicted in tables 2 and 3, reveals the presence of occupational sex segregation and integration. My findings are consistent with those findings of the general population that were discussed previously, in the literature review portion of this paper.

Tables 2 and 3 lead one to conclude that there is a high degree of integration, for there are high concentrations of men and women in related if not the same occupations. However, the full extent of integration as well as segregation is masked by the tables. To grasp the scope of both phenomenon it is most advantageous to compare the separate male and female occupational frequency outputs

for all jobs coded. In doing so, I have found that while there has been much integration of occupations, there still exists a high degree of segregation among certain occupations.

Not all occupations are segregated to the same degree. Some occupations experience lesser degrees as they move towards integration, while other occupations intensify the degree of segregation as the number of same sexed job holders is increased. The most highly segregated task, although not prestige ranked, is that of homemaker. In my sample there have been 48 female homemakers and only 1 male homemaker.

Female dominated occupations in which a high degree of segregation persists are those of registered nurse, secretary, receptionist, cashier, pre-kindergarten and kindergarten teacher, typist, telephone operator, counter clerk and bookkeeper. There have been a few men in various lower level clerical and sales worker positions, but it is primarily women who hold the majority of the sales and clerical positions. Many of the men in clerical or sales related occupations hold supervisory positions. There are both men and women in research oriented occupations, but I feel that it is primarily female dominated because the female involvement percentages have been consistently at least twice those of men.

The "male occupations" which have remained highly segregated are dentist, pharmacist, police, detective,

sheriff, bailiff, and various manual labor jobs including those of carpenter, forgerman, painter and lumberman.

Women have been increasing their numbers in various managerial and administrative positions in the private and public sectors. Women have also increased their representation in the occupations of health administrator, school administrator, bank officer, financial manager, public relations and publicity writer, accountant, lawyer and various computer related occupations. Currently the percentage of women in public and private administrative and managerial positions is 17.3%. The total for men is 27.1%. It is interesting to note that in looking only at public administration, the participation rates are higher for women than men. Even though women have been increasing their numbers in these fields they remain male dominated. Women have not entered into any of the manual labor occupations.

Men have slowly entered or re-entered the "female" occupations of elementary and secondary teacher, bank teller, insurance and real estate agent, librarian and child care worker. The fact that men and women are entering into "opposite-sex" occupations is a favorable sign of the continuing integration of occupations. It is unfortunate that this positive trend is offset by the high number of individuals who continue to enter into those segregated fields, serving only to widen the segregation gap.

Table 1 shows that a fairly high percentage of men and women have become teachers and professors. Separate

occupational frequency tables indicate that the distributions of men and women throughout these jobs is not uniform. A greater percentage of men hold college level teaching positions, while women hold a higher percentage of the lower level teaching positions, especially, as mentioned earlier, at the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten level. For present job, the percentage of men who are college professors is 8.2%, while for women it is 4.1%. In lower level teaching positions the figure for men is 3.1% and 4.1% for women. Although the disparity in the figures for lower level teaching positions is not great, it does intensify when looking back to fifth most recent job.

As exhibited in tables 2 and 3, social work has a high proportion of both men and women, but it is interesting to discover that these figures are considerably lower than percentages recorded for earlier job distributions. Looking back to fifth most recent job, the social work participation rates were 16.7% for men and 18.6% for women. Male participation rates took a dramatic drop to 6.3% and then fell further to 4.2% and 3.6%. Most recent figures pinpoint male participation at 4.2%. Women's rates did not fall as rapidly. Women's participation rates in fourth most recent job were 19.8% followed by a decrease to 18.2% and then a large drop to 10.9% with most recent rates at 9.6%. The lower figures for women can be partially attributed to the fact that many women have been promoted to social work supervisory positions, which, in terms of coding, places

them in the managerial category. The same phenomenon has not been true for men to the extent it has been for women. Regardless, overall participation rates for social work have declined, especially for men. It is impossible to discover the causes for this decline from my data. Nevertheless, my research indicates that social work is becoming a more female dominated field.

I feel that the general occupational participation frequencies for the men and women in my sample are reflective of those rates for the general population. My data most likely show a disproportionately high social work participation rate, which can be attributed to the fact that many social workers have a degree in sociology.

My research indicates that there are still high levels of occupational sex segregation. While some vocations such as lawyer and accountant have become more integrated, still other jobs in the clerical and sales field have become more highly segregated. It appears that once the integration of women into certain occupations begins, other women flock to those fields, but the barriers to initial integration seem to be firmly planted. While a high number of women integrate into a few fields, the corresponding number of men integrate into a wider variety of occupations. As the literature suggests, it may be easier for men to enter into "women's work" than for women to venture into "men's work". Evidence points to increased levels of integration in those fields which currently have low levels of integration, but

the integration of "new" fields will take time. I do not foresee a substantial drop in overall occupational sex segregation levels in the near future.

Occupational Paths And Prestige Levels

William and Mary sociology graduates are found to occupy a variety of occupational status and prestige positions, as was exhibited by tables 1 thru 3, and the wide range of prestige scores that were reported earlier. The diversity in prestige scores is appropriate for the diversity of occupations that they are employed in. The prestige range representation of the graduates is comparable to the general population, except that no sociology graduates have the highest prestige ranking or the lowest ranking, exclusive of the zero score.

The graduates exhibit high rates of occupational mobility. This mobility is in a downward and upward direction, but the earlier reported mean of 6.62 for prestige difference, demonstrates that the bulk of the movement is upward. There are 61 persons who experienced no change in prestige from first to most current prestige ranked occupation. The remaining 261 persons experienced some change in prestige. There were individuals who underwent dramatic prestige alterations, either positive or negative, while others experienced more gradual prestige adjustments.

Although possessing the same undergraduate degree, the graduates did not follow uniform paths upon departure from the college. This is evident from the array of prestige scores and occupations represented by my sample. There were some individuals who went directly into graduate school (approximately 50) and received their graduate degree prior to entrance into the work force. Others chose to immediately enter into the labor force. Some of those graduates who went straight to work following their graduation from the College later returned to pursue coursework or a graduate degree. Advanced degrees were sought in a variety fields, not just sociology. Approximately 24% of my sample chose not to advance their educational training in any form. A few graduates chose to do volunteer work before continuing their education or entering the work force. There were also some graduates who left the work force for a short time, or permanently, in order to care for a family and home. Those who returned to the work force after this type of interruption either did so on a part-time or full-time basis.

Entrance into the work force was not at the same prestige level for all graduates. Some began in high prestige occupations, while others began in lower prestige ranked occupations. As already noted, some individuals remained in occupations with comparable prestige ratings to their first occupation, while others improved their status or suffered a loss of prestige. There are a number of

variables to examine when considering these issues, and they will be dealt with in later sections.

As a single unit, the William and Mary sociology graduates that I have examined have low rates of voluntary unemployment, are upwardly mobile, and are representative of a variety of occupational paths and prestige levels.

Gender Differences In Occupational Paths And Prestige Levels

There are differences in the occupational paths of men and women, but, as prior research in this field has shown, men and women have similar prestige scores. This similarity persists for sociology graduates in looking back to the fifth most recent job. Men and women are not engaged in the same occupational activities, despite the similarity of their mean prestige scores. This finding supports the earlier reported assertions of Patricia Roos. The discussion of occupational sex segregation is further proof of the validity of this finding.

As the literature on the general population suggests, male sociology graduates are engaged in a higher proportion of the low prestige manual labor positions, but also high prestige administrative, managerial, professional and teaching positions. Women occupy a greater proportion of the positions that have less extreme prestige values and center around the mean. The low prestige manual labor jobs held by men have prestige scores in the high teens and low twenties, while the low prestige clerical and sales

positions held by women have prestige scores in the high twenties and thirties. A greater proportion of men are located in the extremes than women. Women do occupy a large proportion of high prestige positions, but at the very highest levels the male job holder percentages are greater than those for women. Men also "jump" from one extreme to the other, while women appear to move to and from occupations with a more limited prestige range.

Women remain in the lower status clerical and sales jobs for extended periods of time, while most of the men in my sample only held manual labor jobs for a brief period of time. I classify these "male" jobs as "transition jobs", because often times they were obtained immediately following graduation and were quickly replaced with an occupation with a higher prestige ranking. Although there were many women who entered into lower prestige jobs following graduation, the turnover rate within these jobs does not appear to be as dramatic. Many women who returned to work following the birth of a child also obtained some of these low prestige sales and clerical positions.

An examination of prestige mobility percentages reveals that, overall, men were slightly more mobile than women, despite the fact that the mean for total number of jobs held revealed that men and women on average, have held the same number of jobs. Men were more mobile, not for the total number of jobs held, but for the dramatic increases and decreases in prestige that they experienced. The percentage

of men who experienced some degree of mobility was 75.4% and the percentage of women was 73.9%. Men suffered the highest rates of downward mobility, 29.9% as compared to 21.7% for women, and women experienced the highest percentages of upward mobility, 52.2%. The male percentage was 45.5%. A slightly higher percent of women (26.1%) experienced no mobility over the corresponding percentages for men (24.6%). These figures imply that women are improving their prestige standings to a greater extent than men are, yet women are still less mobile. The most extreme rates of mobility, jumps of 25 points in either direction, are experienced by higher percentages of men than women. Extreme downward mobility drops were experienced by 6.5% of the men and 2.5% of the women. There is more disparity in these figures when looking at extreme upward mobility jumps. A total of 19.5% of the men increased their prestige by 25 points or more, while only 11.8% of the women were able to do so. I believe that one reason why women don't experience the dramatic shifts in prestige is because, as earlier stated, as a whole they don't occupy a high proportion of the extreme prestige positions from which to rise from or fall to. The occupations women are distributed in do not allow for dramatic shifts in prestige. In recalling the mean prestige difference scores for men and women, they both hover around 6, indicating that mobility, overall, is in the upward direction for William and Mary sociology graduates.

In looking at the interruption of careers, both men and women have left their jobs to resume their education and receive advanced degrees. However, it is almost entirely women who have left their careers for child rearing and homemaking reasons. Only one male in my sample left his job to become a "homemaker". There are also women who have interrupted their careers more than once for childbearing reasons. Many women, after having children, have often returned to work, but only on a part time basis. The career paths of men do not suffer from as many interruptions or changes in employment status as those of women. Once again sociology graduates show patterns similar to the general population.

In summary, my findings are similar to those of earlier conducted studies in this area. I do, however, find that women are slowly increasing their representation in the higher prestige fields. Still, as findings on occupational segregation suggest, many women still enter into the clerical, secretarial, and sales positions which do not offer high prestige ranked positions.

Regression Analysis: Present Occupational Prestige (PRES1)
And Occupational Mobility (PRESDIFF)

This section will include discussions of the explanatory power of certain variables with respect to present occupational prestige and prestige difference or mobility. Differences between present prestige (PRES1) and

most recent prestige ranked occupation (CURPRES) will also be noted. Tables 4, 5, and 6 located on the next pages will be referenced in these discussions. The tables were constructed from the results of multivariate regression analysis. Gender was included in the overall regressions as

TABLE 4
REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR PRESENT OCCUPATION

Dependent Variable						

PRES1						

overall men women						

Independent Variable	r	beta	r	beta	r	beta

Educ	.50	.425****	.54	.466****	.47	.407****
Totyears	.21	.134*	.29	.144	.16	.111
Presdiff	.52	.486****	.55	.507****	.51	.470****
Mrstatus	.09	-.059	.16	-.064	.04	-.060
Child	.08	.036	.12	-.042	.07	.085
Totjobs	-.07	-.110*	-.16	-.161*	-.01	-.067
Gend	.03	.027	--	--	--	--

Constant		45.63		47.23		46.54
R squared		.51		.61		.46
N=		(215)		(75)		(140)

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001
****p<.0001

Definition of Variables:

Pres1=Prestige score for present occupation (includes only those persons who are employed)

Educ=level of post graduate education attained

Totyears=total number of years since graduation

Presdiff=difference between first and most recent prestige ranked occupation

Mrstatus=current marital status

Child=number of children

Totjobs=total number of jobs held since graduation

Gend=gender

TABLE 5
REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR PRESTIGE DIFFERENCE

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable					
	----- PRESDIFF -----					
	overall		men		women	

	r	beta	r	beta	r	beta
Educ	.11	.140*	.04	.070	.16	.169*
Totyears	-.13	-.124	-.11	-.085	-.14	-.140
Mrstatus	-.08	-.036	-.26	-.268*	.01	.091
Child	-.12	-.048	-.06	.056	-.15	-.106
Totjobs	-.08	-.040	-.11	-.068	-.07	-.034
Gend	-.00	.000	--	--	--	--
Constant	11.35		19.20		8.66	
R squared	.04		.09		.07	
N=	(238)		(77)		(161)	

*p<.05						
**p<.01						
***p<.001						
****p<.0001						

Definition of Variables:
Educ=level of post graduate education attained
Totyears=total number of years since graduation
Presdiff=difference between first and most recent prestige ranked occupation
Mrstatus=current marital status
Child=number of children
Totjobs=total number of jobs held since graduation
Gend=gender

TABLE 6
REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR MOST RECENT PRESTIGE RANKED
OCCUPATION HELD

Dependent Variable						
CURPRES						
Independent Variable	overall		men		women	
	r	beta	r	beta	r	beta
Educ	.45	.391****	.54	.480****	.40	.352****
Totyears	.21	.151**	.25	.117	.19	.158*
Presdiff	.52	.482****	.55	.410****	.50	.470****
Mrstatus	.09	-.062	.13	-.090	.05	-.054
Child	.07	.023	.09	-.048	.06	.052
Totjobs	-.06	-.116*	-.17	-.155*	.01	-.080
Gend	-.01	.022	--	--	--	--
Constant		46.18		48.18		46.53
R squared		.48		.61		.42
N=		(238)		(77)		(161)

*p<.05
 **p<.01
 ***p<.001
 ****p<.0001

Definition of Variables:
 Curpres=most recent prestige ranked occupation held
 Educ=level of post graduate education attained
 Totyears=total number of years since graduation
 Presdiff=difference between first and most recent prestige
 ranked occupation
 Mrstatus=current marital status
 Child=number of children
 Totjobs=total number of jobs held since graduation
 Gend=gender

a dummy variable and was found to be insignificant. The sample sizes ("N") are not uniform for all tables. The figures for PRES1 are smaller because included in this variable are only those individuals who are currently holding a prestige ranked occupation. CURPRES examines the most recent prestige ranked position that the individual has held. This, in some cases, is not the present activity that the person is engaged in. The sample size for PRESDIFF and CURPRES are the same because both variables look at the occupational history of the individual, not only the present occupation.

A brief discussion of the linkage between prestige ranking and the sex of the job holder will conclude this section.

Number Of Years Since Graduation (TOTYEARS)

The number of years since graduation has a positive and statistically significant relationship to the prestige of current occupation when examining combined outputs for men and women ($\beta = .134$, $p < .05$). However, when separate gender outputs are examined, although positively related to present prestige, the total number of years since graduation is not statistically significant. These findings are displayed in table 4. As noted in Table 5 the extent of one's upward or downward mobility is not significantly related to the length of time since graduation. This is found to be true for both men and women.

Level Of Educational Attainment (EDUC)

As prior research has indicated, one's level of educational attainment is positively related to present occupational prestige. Table 4 shows that educational attainment is powerful overall ($\beta = .425$, $p < .0001$) and also in separate regressions for men and women. Education has slightly greater power when explaining the variance in the current prestige of men ($\beta = .466$, $p < .0001$) than women ($\beta = .407$, $p < .0001$). Nevertheless, figures show that the level of educational attainment is positively correlated with the present prestige of both sexes.

This positive correlation between education and present prestige is further evidenced through an examination of the overall prestige frequency outputs for the education variable. The mean prestige for individuals with no further graduate training is 50.38, for those who completed coursework it is 53.05, for those with a Master's degree it is 56.61, and the mean prestige score for those who obtained the highest graduate degree is 69.51. The reason that the women in my sample are underrepresented at the top of the prestige hierarchy can be attributed partially to their overall lower levels of educational attainment. To recapitulate earlier reported figures, only 9.4% of the women received a PhD or Law degree, while 18.8% of the men did.

The variance in mobility can be somewhat explained by the education variable. As shown in Table 5, education is positively correlated and statistically significant with mobility when looking at overall mobility patterns and the patterns for women ($\beta=.140$, $p<.05$) ($\beta=.169$, $p<.05$). A positive relationship between these variables exists also for men, but it is not statistically significant ($\beta=.070$). In general, sociology graduates with higher levels of educational attainment experience higher rates of upward mobility.

Marital Status (MRSTATUS)

Prior research has shown marital status to affect the present prestige level of women; my research findings do not support this assertion for sociology graduates.. Table 4 illustrates that marital status is not a statistically significant predictor of the present prestige for men or women. The present prestige of the women in my sample is not related to their marital status. If differences in prestige between married and unmarried women exists, it is not attributable to the fact that they are or are not married.

It is interesting to discover that the marital status of male sociology graduates is shown to have a statistically significant negative effect on their mobility ($\beta=-.268$, $p<.05$). The mobility of female sociology graduates is not affected by their marital status ($\beta=.091$). Table 5

evidences this. As earlier reported, the net mobility movement is upward, but as these figures imply, a male sociology graduate's degree of mobility is limited by his marital status. Mobility rates are higher for unmarried male sociology graduates. Surprisingly, the mobility of female sociology graduates is unaffected by their marital status.

Number Of Children (CHILD)

My findings indicate that the number of children in the home does not have a statistically significant effect on one's present prestige level. This is consistent with the findings of earlier researchers. Table 5 shows that the number of children is as equally unrelated to one's mobility. The present prestige of male and female sociology graduates and their mobility, is not related to the number of children that they have.

Total Number Of Jobs (TOTJOBS)

Table 4 shows that the total number of jobs held is negatively correlated and statistically significant with the present prestige of sociology graduates ($\beta = -.110$, $p < .05$), specifically to the present prestige of men ($\beta = -.161$, $p < .05$). It was reported earlier that on average, men and women have held the same number of jobs (3.5), yet the present prestige of women is unaffected by the number of jobs she holds. These findings suggest that male sociology

graduates who have held a greater number of jobs have lower present prestige scores than males who have held fewer jobs. The same is not true for women.

Mobility, upward or downward, is unrelated to the total number of jobs that sociology graduates have held. One would think that changing jobs is related to one's overall level of mobility. Table 5 shows that this is not so. The frequency with which one changes occupations does not necessarily denote a significant change in one's prestige ranking.

Difference In Prestige (PRESDIFF)

Mobility, or the difference in prestige from first to most current occupation, is positively related to present occupational prestige for the total sample ($\beta = .486$, $p < .0001$) and in separate regressions for men and women ($\beta = .507$, $p < .0001$) ($\beta = .470$, $p < .0001$). The significance of this variable, as shown by the above figures and Table 4, imply that by knowing how much upward or downward mobility an individual has experienced, one can better explain the present prestige ranking of that individual. This variable has the greatest explanatory power for the present prestige of men. On average, sociology graduates are upwardly mobile, and thus upward mobility is reflected by the present occupation.

Relationship Of Occupational Status And Prestige To Sex Of Job Holder

From my research I am unable to determine, exactly, whether or not occupational status and prestige is directly linked to the sex of the job holder. The separate regressions for men and women are quite similar, and when gender is employed as a dummy variable in overall regressions, it shows no statistically significant relationship with either current occupational prestige (PRES1) or occupational mobility (PRESDIFF). After working with the NORC occupational and prestige codes, I have come to believe that the prestige label attached to a particular occupation is related, not to gender, but to the value label individuals attach to that occupation. The prestige rank assigned to a particular occupation is proportional to the value label members of our society place on the function that occupation serves in society. Those occupations with the highest prestige rating are those that are most highly valued by members of our society, and vice versa for low prestige occupations.

If occupations were assigned a prestige rating on the basis of the dominant sexed job holders, and the literature suggests that "male" occupations are ranked higher than "female" occupations, then why don't the "male" manual labor jobs have a higher prestige rating than the "female" clerical jobs? I feel that the relative importance of the function a particular occupation "plays" in society is more

important than the gender of the person performing that function.

Discussion Of Findings

My findings indicate that William and Mary sociology graduates are engaged in a variety of occupational activities. It is perhaps unfortunate to discover that despite the diversity amongst them, a high degree of gender based occupational segregation persists. A number of persons have begun to move into opposite-sex occupations, serving to promote integration, but still greater numbers move into segregated occupations. Consequently, overall segregation levels are not reduced. The mean prestige scores for men and women are similar, despite the fact that they are employed in different occupations. Men have higher rates of overall mobility as well as more extreme prestige shifts. The prestige changes for women are often less dramatic, but figures show that overall movement is in an upward direction.

The variables of educational attainment, total number of years since graduation, prestige difference, marital status, number of children, and total number of jobs since graduation account for approximately half of the variance (.51) in the present prestige of the sociology graduates. In looking at the overall present prestige of the graduates the strongest and positively correlated determinants are prestige difference or mobility, educational attainment, and

then total number of years since graduation. The total number of jobs held is statistically significant, but it is negatively correlated with one's current prestige, especially the present prestige of men. As pointed out earlier the present prestige scores of men and women are not effected by these variables in a uniform manner.

Regression analysis shows that the present prestige of male sociology graduates is positively correlated and statistically significant with the degree of mobility they experience and their level of educational attainment. Yet, the greater the total number of jobs that they have held, the lower their current prestige appears to be. The present prestige of men is not significantly affected by their marital status, number of children, and the total number of years since graduation. The findings imply that a male sociology graduate with a high present prestige score has experienced a dramatic increase in prestige, obtained advanced educational degrees, and has held few jobs. Since changing jobs often is detrimental to his prestige, a man must get maximum returns on occupational changes and dramatically increase his prestige from one job to the next. As will be shown shortly, this is not true of women. The family life and year of graduation are relatively unimportant to the present prestige of a male sociology graduate.

The present prestige of female sociology graduates is positively correlated with their degree of mobility and

their level of educational attainment. Contrary to the literature, their marital status has no significant effect upon their present prestige. In addition to marital status, neither does the number of years since graduation, the number of jobs held, or the number of children have an effect on their present prestige. Findings indicate that if a woman possesses a high present prestige score she would have experienced a dramatic increase in prestige, but unlike men, she could have gone through numerous jobs before elevating her prestige. This is so because the number of jobs she has held does not effect her current prestige. To have a high prestige she most likely has also obtained an advanced educational degree. Her year of graduation, marital status, and number of children will not effect her present prestige.

An examination of most recent prestige ranked occupation held (CURPRES) reveals some differences from present prestige when examining the explanatory power of the variables. To reiterate an earlier point, CURPRES includes those 40 individuals, mostly females, who are not included in PRES1 because they are not currently employed. CURPRES looks at the prestige these individuals possessed prior to their unemployment. The variable differences between PRES1 and CURPRES are illustrated in Tables 4 and 6. The overall strength of the total number of years since graduation is greater for most recent prestige ($\beta = .151$, $p < .01$) than for present prestige ($\beta = .134$, $p < .05$). The total number of

years since graduation is statistically significant for women when determining most recent prestige ($\beta=.158$, $p<.05$). There are no statistically significant differences for men. In comparing the betas for the variables of education and mobility it is interesting to note that the strength of education for men diminishes from CURPRES to PRES1, while it increases for women. The strength of mobility greatly increases for men, yet it remains constant for women. These comparisons suggest that for those women who remain in the labor market, it is their level of educational attainment which will have the greatest positive effect upon their prestige. However, for men, the level of educational attainment loses strength as their mobility and total number of jobs held gain in importance in predicting their present prestige.

The statistically significant positive correlation between mobility and present prestige as well as most recent prestige has already been noted. It is now valuable to further examine those variables which, in part, are determinative of the extent of mobility experienced by sociology graduates. I must first note that very little of the variance in mobility can be accounted for by the variables that I have examined ($<.10$). Overall variance can be attributed to a positive correlation between education and mobility. This is true for women, more so than it is for men. It is surprising to find that education, while a positive relationship to mobility exists, is not

statistically significant to the mobility for males. It is, however, interesting to find that a statistically significant negative correlation between marital status and mobility is present for men. Marital status, while not statistically significant in its relationship to mobility, is still a positive factor for women. This finding with respect to marital status and its relation to mobility is fascinating. From the literature one is led to believe that marital status is detrimental to the occupational paths of women and yet my findings do not show this to be true. It is, in fact, the male sociology graduates who are hindered by the presence of a spousal relationship.

My findings have shown that despite the numerous similarities between William and Mary sociology graduates and the general population of the United States, the sociology graduates have exhibited some striking differences. The most notable difference being the negative effect that marital status was shown to have on the mobility of males, while it had no corresponding effect on females. The literature had suggested that the marital status of women would have an effect upon their prestige, but there was no mention of the negative effect a man's marital status would have upon his mobility.

As a whole, the graduates can be found in a variety of occupations with diverse prestige scores. Sociology graduates get high prestige returns on their educational investments, as do members of the general population. I do

not have average prestige scores for the general population, but I suspect that the scores for my sample are above average. I attribute the high prestige scores to the large percentage of individuals who obtained some form of post-graduate education.

My research indicates that William and Mary sociology graduates are not restricted any more than the general population, with respect to occupational choices and prestigious positions. There have been steady increases in the number of women entering into male dominated fields, but not enough to reduce segregation levels. Women are attaining high prestige positions, but are still the minority. I feel that education will increasingly become more important in determining one's prestige level, as overall levels of education are raised.

CONCLUSION

My research, although partially supportive of earlier research, has clearly shown that there are some changes taking place with regards to the occupational paths and prestige levels of men and women. My findings are not generalizable to the larger population because of the homogeneity amongst the individuals in my sample. Regardless, my findings indicate that further research is needed on this topic to discover the extent to which the dissimilarities that I have uncovered are present in the larger population.

It is evident from my research that William and Mary sociology graduates are achieving high levels of prestige and status which is primarily based upon their educational attainment and mobility. I have shown the existence of occupational sex segregation amongst the graduates as well as differences in the status attainment patterns of both men and women. This research is important for it offers a direction for further research into the issues I have put forth. Why does occupational sex segregation persist? Why does marital status have a negative effect on male mobility? Why doesn't the number of children and marital status of women affect their prestige or mobility? Is education becoming a more crucial determining factor of one's status

and prestige level? These are questions that need to be answered in the future.

APPENDIX A

SOCIOLOGY ASSESSMENT CODE BOOK

COLUMNS	VARIABLES
1-3	IDNUM, Identification Number
4-7	YRGRAD, Year of Graduation
8	Employ, Current Employment Status
9-11	JOB1, Description of Most Recent Job (NORC codes: 442 in total. Of those, 123 are represented by the sample population. 7 additional codes were also created for the purpose of this study and are included in the listing)
	000=not currently employed
	001=accountant
	003=computer programmer
	004=computer systems analyst
	005=computer specialist, nec
	022=sales engineer
	031=lawyer
	032=librarian
	036=statistician
	055=operations and system researcher and analyst
	056=personnel and labor relation worker
	062=dentist
	064=pharmacist
	073=health practitioner, nec
	075=registered nurse
	076=therapist
	085=health technologist and technician
	086=clergymen
	090=religious worker, nec
	093=psychologist
	094=sociologist
	095=urban and regional planner
	100=social worker
	101=recreational worker
	104=biology teacher
	113=health specialist teacher
	115=business and commerce teacher
	121=sociology teacher

122=social science teacher
124=coaches and physical
education teacher
126=english teacher
134=trade, industrial or
technical teacher
135=misc. teacher, college level
140=teacher college level,
subject not specified
142=elementary school teacher
143=pre-kindergarten or
kindergarten teacher
144=secondary school teacher
145=teacher, except college, nec
152=draftsman
173=technicians, nec
174=vocational and educational
counselor
180=athlete or kindred worker
183=designer
184=editor or reporter
185=musician or composer
190=painter or sculptor
192=public relation person or
publicity writer
193=radio or television announcer
194=writer, artist or entertainer
195=research worker, nec
196=professional, technical or
kindred worker- allocated
201=assessor, controller,
treasurer, local public admin
202=bank officer or financial
manager
205=buyer, wholesale or retail
trade
210=credit person
212=health administrator
216=manager and superintendent,
building
220=office manager
222=official or administrator,
public administration
224=postmaster or mail
superintendent
225=purchasing agent or buyer,
nec
230=restaurant, cafeteria or bar
manager
231=sales manager or department
head, retail trade
233=sales manager, except retail
trade
235=school admin, college

240=school admin, elementary and
secondary
245=manager or administrator, nec
246=manager or administrator,
except farm- allocated
260=advertising agent or salesman
265=insurance agent, broker or
underwriter
270=real estate agent or broker
271=stock and bond salesman
281=sales representative,
manufacturing industries
282=sales represetnative,
wholesale trade
283=sales clerk, retail trade
284=salesman, retail trade
285=salesman of services
or construction
296=sales worker- allocated
301=bank teller
305=bookkeeper
310=cashier
312=clerical supervisor, nec
313=collector, bill and account
314=counter clerk, except food
315=dispatcher or starter,
vehicle
320=enumerator or interviewer
321=estimator or investigator
326=insurance adjuster, examiner
or investigator
330=library attendant or
assistant
343=computer or peripheral
equipment operator
355=office machine operator
360=payroll and timekeeping clerk
364=receptionist
370=secretary, legal
372=secretary, nec
374=shipping and receiving clerk
385=telephone operator
391=typist
394=misc. clerical worker
395=not specified clerical worker
396=clerical and kindred worker-
allocated
415=carpenter
442=forgemen or hammerman
510=painter, construction or
maintenance
575=craftsman or kindred worker,
nec
590=current member of the Armed

Forces

714=taxicab driver or chauffeur
 751=construction laborer, except
 carpenters' helper
 761=lumberman, raftsmen or
 woodchopper
 780=misc. laborer
 796=laborer, except farm-
 allocated
 910=bartender
 911=busperson
 915=waiter or waitress
 922=health aide, except nursing
 925=nursing aide, orderly or
 attendant
 942=child care worker, except
 private household
 954=welfare service aide
 962=guard or watchman
 964=policeman or detective
 965=sheriff or bailiff
 976=service worker, except
 private household- allocated
 980=child care worker, private
 household
 986=private household worker-
 allocated
 990=graduate student, teaching
 assistant
 991=graduate student, research
 assistant
 992=graduate student, nec
 993=homemaker
 994=management trainee
 995=trainee, nec
 996=self employed, nec

12-13	PRES1, NORC Prestige rating of JOB1
14-16	JOB2, Description of second most recent job
17-18	PRES2, NORC Prestige rating of JOB2
19-21	JOB3, Description of third most recent job
22-23	PRES3, NORC Prestige rating of JOB3
24-26	JOB4, Description of fourth most recent job
27-28	PRES4, NORC Prestige rating of JOB4

29-31	JOB5, Description of fifth most recent job
32-33	PRES5, NORC Prestige rating of JOB5
34-35	YEARSJ1, Years in JOB1
36-37	YEARSJ2, Years in JOB2
38-39	YEARSJ3, Years in JOB3
40-41	YEARSJ4, Years in JOB4
42-43	YEARSJ5, Years in JOB5
44-45	TOTJOBS, Total number of jobs since graduation
46-47	TOTWORK, Total number of years worked (computer generated)
48-49	TOTYEARS, Total number of years since graduation (computer generated)
50	PLANS, Future employment plans 1=no plans 2=plan to remain in present job 3=plan regular career advance 4=plan manjor career change 5=uncertain
51	AVRLG, Religious organizations 1=yes 2=no
52	AVEDORG, Educational organizations 1=yes 2=no
53	AVCLUB, Social club 1=yes 2=no
54	AVPOL, Political organizations 1=yes 2=no
55	AVPUBINT, Public interest groups

- 1=yes
2=no
- 56 AVSPORT, Sports
- 1=yes
2=no
- 57 AVFAF, Involvement with family and friends
- 1=yes
2=no
- 58 AVPHIL, Philanthropic, non religious or education
- 1=yes
2=no
- 59 AVBUS, Business, civic organizations
- 1=yes
2=no
- 60 AVARTS, Fine arts, music, performing arts
- 1=yes
2=no
- 61-62 AVHOBBY, Hobbies
- 01=running or jogging
02=reading or writing
03=swimming
04=boating, motor and sail
05=hunting, game or skeet
06=fishing, angler or sport
07=knitting or sewing
08=woodworking or crafts
09=collector of items
10=racquetball
11=tennis
12=golf
13=hiking, spelunking
14=rafting
15=camping
16=computer games
17=no hobbies listed
18=games and puzzles
19=dancing
20=wine tasting

21=gardening
 22=travel
 23=cards
 24=aerobics
 25=flying
 26=restoration (house, cars)
 27=horseback riding
 28=photography
 29=raises cats, dogs

63

AVCCH, Coaching

1=soccer
 2=football
 3=baseball, teeball
 4=basketball
 5=softball
 6=swimming
 7=cheerleading
 8=other
 9=no coaching activities listed

64-65

AVOCTOT, Total number of avocational activities

00=list AV Activities NOT codeable
 01-98=number corresponds to the total number of codeable AV activities
 99=no response or blank

66-67

AVOCTIME, Hours/week spent on avocational activities

00=blank
 01=no time for activities; none
 02=one to five hours/week
 03=six to ten hours/week
 04=eleven to fifteen hours/week
 05=more than sixteen hours/week
 06=important but no time listed

68

POSTGRAD, Have pursued post graduate education

1=no
 2=yes

69

SOCPOST, Post-graduate education Soc.

1=none
 2=coursework
 3=masters

4=doctorate

70 LAWPOST, Post-graduate education Law

```
l=None
```

2=coursework

3=Law Degree

71 BUSPOST, Post-graduate education Bus.

```
1=None
```

2=coursework

3=masters

4=doctorate

72 EDUPOST, Post-graduate education Ed.

```
l=None
```

2=coursework

3=masters

4=doctorate

73 SOCWPOST, Post-graduate education in
 Soc. Work

1=None

2=coursework

3=masters

4=doctorate

74 PUBAPOST, Post-graduate education in
Public Administration

1=none

2=coursework

3=masters

4=doctorate

75 URBPPOST, Post-graduate education in
 Urban Planning

```
l=None
```

2=coursework

3=masters

4=doctorate

RECORD NUMBER 2

1-3	IDNUMM, Identification number, same as IDNUM
-----	---

4 OTHPOST, Other post-graduate work

```
l=None
```

- 2=coursework
3=masters
4=doctorate
- 5 MOREPOST, Further graduate ed plans
- 0=no answer or blank
1=no
2=yes
3=maybe
- 6 FFIELD, Field of future graduate ed
- 0=none
1=religion
2=sociology
3=law
4=business
5=education
6=social work
7=public administration
8=urban planning
9=other
- 7 MRSTATUS, Marital status
- 1=married
2=widowed
3=divorced
4=separated
5=never married
6=other, not provided
- 8-9 CHILD, Number of children
- 00-98=total number listed
99=blank
- 10 GEND, Gender
- 1=male
2=female
- 11-12 MAJORED, Reasons for majoring in Soc.
- 00=no answer
01=faculty
02=interest in people, groups
03=course content
04=career possibilities
05=liberal arts
06=intro course
07="save the world"
08=easy major, easier major

09=family member encouraged
 10=friends encouraged
 11=related to many social
 sciences
 12=other

13 SOCAREER, Importance of sociology for
 career development

1=very important
 2=moderately important
 3=moderately unimportant
 4=very unimportant

14-15 CAREEVAL, Reasons for evaluating
 importance of sociology
 in career development

00=no answer
 01=not important
 02=sociological insight helpful
 03=job is people oriented
 04=sociology required for current
 job
 05=theory and methods skills
 helpful
 06=gave different view of world
 07=understanding of
 organizational behavior
 08=shaped personal philosophy
 09=good liberal arts discipline
 10=appreciation for diversity

16 SOCPERS, Importance of sociology for
 personal development

1=very important
 2=moderately important
 3=moderately unimportant
 4=very unimportant

17-18 PERSEVAL, Reasons for evaluating
 importance of sociology in
 personal development

00=no answer
 01=expanded intellectual horizons
 02=understand group interaction
 03=not important in personal dev.
 04=developed compassion,
 understanding
 05=developed critical thinking
 skills
 06=more politically aware

07=self understanding, personal
philosophy
08=gave world perspective
09=help with family
10=understand socio-historical
influences
11=understand gender influences
12=undrestand racial influences
13=underclass dynamics

- 19 OADDRISS, Learned how to address
 issues sociologically
- 0=no answer
 1=unimportant outcome
 2
 3
 4
 5=very important outcome
- 20 OSELFUND, Gained better self
 understanding
- 0=no answer
 1=unimportant outcome
 2
 3
 4
 5=very important outcome
- 21 OUNDSOCT, Gained better understanding
 of human societies
- 0=no answer
 1=unimportant outcome
 2
 3
 4
 5=very important outcome
- 22 OSOCTH, Evaluate competing
 sociological theories
- 0=no answer
 1=unimportant outcome
 2
 3
 4
 5=very important outcome
- 23 ORESSK, Improved research skills
- 0=no answer
 1=unimportant outcome

2

3

4

5=very important outcome

24 OPCRSC, Completed a piece of research

0=no answer

1=unimportant outcome

2

3

4

5=very important outcome

25 OGRADSCH, Prepared for graduate
or professional school

0=no answer

1=unimportant outcome

2

3

4

5=very important outcome

26 OJOBSC, Developed job related skills
and insights

0=no answer

1=unimportant outcome

2

3

4

5=very important outcome

27 OANLSK, Increased analytical and
interpretive skills

0=no answer

1=unimportant outcome

2

3

4

5=very important outcome

28 OVBWR, Enhanced verbal and written
expression

0=no answer

1=unimportant outcome

2

3

4

5=very important outcome

- 29 OOTHOUT1, Other outcome
- 0=no answer
 1=unimportant outcome
 2
 3
 4
 5=very important outcome
- 30 OOTHOUT2, Other outcome
- 0=no answer
 1=unimportant outcome
 2
 3
 4
 5=very important outcome
- 31 EOVCUR, Overall curriculum
- 0=no answer
 1=srength
 2=weakness
 3=uncertain
- 32 ECORREQ, Core requirements
- 0=no answer
 1=srength
 2=weakness
 3=uncertain
- 33 EINDRSCH, Independent research
 opportunities
- 0=no answer
 1=srength
 2=weakness
 3=uncertain
- 34 EFAC, Faculty
- 0=no answer
 1=srength
 2=weakness
 3=uncertain
- 35 ECLINST, Classroom instruction
- 0=no answer
 1=srength
 2=weakness
 3=uncertain

- 36 EFACHLP, Faculty assistance outside
of class
- 0=no answer
1=srength
2=weakness
3=uncertain
- 37 EPTFRCH, Participation in faculty
research
- 0=no answer
1=srength
2=weakness
3=uncertain
- 38 WCARPREP, Career preparation
- 0=no answer
1=srength
2=weakness
3=uncertain
- 39 EGRADPRP, Preparation for graduate
school
- 0=no answer
1=srength
2=weakness
3=uncertain
- 40 EEXTRAC, Extra-curricular activities
- 0=no answer
1=srength
2=weakness
3=uncertain
- 41 EDFACIL. Department facilities
- 0=no answer
1=srength
2=weakness
3=uncertain
- 42 EDEV1, Other
- 0=no answer
1=srength
2=weakness
3=uncertain
- 43 EDEV2, Other

0=no answer
 1=srength
 2=weakness
 3=uncertain

44 RATESOC, Rating of sociology program

0=no answer
 1=excellent
 2=good
 3=fair
 4=poor

45-46 PROGRATE, Comments on rating program

00=no answer
 01=good, overall curriculum
 02=good, faculty
 03=good, better than others
 04=good, senior thesis
 05=good, provided outlook
 06=good, developed skills
 07=bad, more international needed
 08=bad, more practical experience
 09=bad, more computer work,
 statistics
 10=bad, better faculty
 11=bad, faculty too narrow
 12=bad, faculty not approachable
 13=bad, can't find job or high
 pay job
 14=bad, general

47 CONCSOC, Concentrate in sociology

1=definitely would
 2=probably would
 3=probably would not
 4=definitely would not

48-49 COMCON, Comments on concentration

00=no answer
 01=yes, no qualifications
 02=yes, important to outlook
 03=yes, important to job
 04=yes, shaped personal
 philosophy
 05=yes, also business, economics
 06=yes, also psychology
 07=yes, also government
 08=yes, also anthropology
 09=yes, education
 10=no, can't find job or high pay

job
 11=no, business
 12=no, psychology
 13=no, government
 14=no, anthropology
 15=no, education
 16=no, religion
 17=no, history
 18=yes, other
 19=no, other

50-51 IMPROVE, Comments on improving major
 in sociology

00=no answer
 01=more career counseling
 02=more independent research
 03=improve quality of faculty
 04=expand department
 05=more internships, practicums
 06=smaller classes
 07=keep quality faculty
 08=stick to basics
 09=keep theory orientation
 10=treat students as persons
 11=more business applications
 12=more computer work
 13=more female faculty
 14=more black faculty
 15=more applied coursework
 16=suggest related courses
 elsewhere
 17=more informal get togethers
 18=social work orientation
 19=more "real world" applications
 20=more public policy
 21=more discussion
 22=more course offerings

52 DEGREE, When graduate degree was
 obtained, if any

0=no degree received
 1=degree received prior to
 working
 2=degree received after working
 3=uncertain when degree received

53 LEADER, Individual holding a
 leadership position in
 advocational activities

0=no stated leadership role,
 can't be determined

1=leadership role stated

54-56

PRESDIFF, Difference between first
prestige position and most
recent prestige position

(+ or - number

APPENDIX B



DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
Alumni Survey

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
FOUNDED IN 1693
WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA 23185

Telephone
(804) 253-4326

Dear Sociology Graduate:

The College of William and Mary is undertaking a thorough assessment of its undergraduate programs. The assessment focuses on both general education and undergraduate majors (concentrations) in arts and sciences, business, and education. Sociology is one of five pilot departments being examined in this first year of assessment. With your help, we want to learn more about our strengths and weaknesses as we plan for the future.

One part of the Sociology assessment plan is an outside review of our undergraduate program. It focuses on requirements for concentrators and minors, general education courses, and special opportunities for undergraduates (for example, independent studies and internships). A second part of the plan involves evaluations of senior essays written by current sociology majors. The third part of the plan is a survey of sociology alumni from the past twenty years. The goals of the survey are to learn something about your post-graduate experiences, to get your thoughts on the importance of a sociology background up to this point in your life, and to benefit from your reflections about the strengths and weaknesses of your undergraduate training in sociology.

You have been included in a sample of sociology alumni dating back to 1968. Please help us by completing the enclosed questionnaire. Some of the questions may be answered by simply checking the appropriate box. Other items ask you either to write in a short description or briefly comment in any manner you deem appropriate. The questionnaire should take about 15-20 minutes to complete and can be returned in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

To ensure a representative sample of sociology alumni, it is important that we achieve a high response rate of those who have been selected. Please be assured that your responses will be completely confidential. The ID numbers at the top of the questionnaires are being used by us to identify non-respondents who will be surveyed in a second mailing. Findings from the study will be presented in aggregate form only, and no individual graduate will ever be identified by name.

My colleagues and I have appreciated very much the opportunity of working with so many of you in the past. We hope to hear from you, to learn about and from your experiences, and to benefit from your thoughts and recollections. The information we seek will enable us to better serve present and future students of William and Mary. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Kreps

Gary A. Kreps
Professor and Chair

Members of the Sociology Faculty

David Aday
Lawrence Beckhouse
Vernon Edmonds
Michael Faia
Satoshi Ito
Jon Kerner
Wayne Kernodle (Emeritus)
Victor Liguori
Edwin Rhyne
John Stanfield (Cummings Professor of Sociology and American Studies)
Elaine Themo
Marion Vanfossen

ALUMNI SURVEY: DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

ID# _____

Background Information

When did you graduate from William and Mary? _____

Are you currently employed? ☐ Yes, employed full-time
 ☐ Yes, employed part-time
 ☐ No, not currently employed

If you are not currently employed, please skip to the next question. If you are currently employed, please provide us with your job title, a brief description of your work activities, and the time period of employment (dates) in your current job.

Please also summarize your employment history since graduating from the College (earliest to most recent position). It would be helpful if you could describe briefly the kinds of positions you have held in the past, and during what time periods. Feel free to add a sheet if you need more space.

Job Descriptions

Time Periods

What are your employment plans for the future?

We would like you now to describe your major avocational and other personal interests and activities (such as voluntary associations, political action groups, social clubs, hobbies, and other leisure pursuits). It would be helpful in this regard if you could indicate how important these kinds of activities are to you and how much time you spend on them.

Have you pursued any post-graduate education? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If yes, please indicate in what field(s) and highest level of education attained (check all fields that apply)

☐ Sociology: ☐ Coursework ☐ Master's ☐ Doctorate
☐ Law: ☐ Coursework ☐ Law Degree
☐ Business: ☐ Coursework ☐ Master's ☐ Doctorate
☐ Education: ☐ Coursework ☐ Master's ☐ Doctorate
☐ Social Work: ☐ Coursework ☐ Master's ☐ Doctorate
☐ Public Admin: ☐ Coursework ☐ Master's ☐ Doctorate
☐ Urban Planning: ☐ Coursework ☐ Master's ☐ Doctorate
☐ Other: (What Field? _____)
☐ Coursework ☐ Master's ☐ Doctorate

Do you plan to pursue post-graduate education beyond that noted in the previous question? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If yes, in what field _____

Are you currently — married, widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never been married?

☐ Married ☐ Divorced ☐ Never married
☐ Widowed ☐ Separated

Do you have any children? ☐ No ☐ Yes If yes, how many and what are their ages _____

What is your gender? ☐ Male ☐ Female

Sociology Training, Career and Personal Development

What is your best recollection of why you majored in sociology?

Considering the employment history and plans you described earlier, to what extent has your undergraduate background in sociology been important to your career development?

☐ Very important ☐ Moderately unimportant
☐ Moderately important ☐ Very unimportant

Briefly describe the reason(s) for this evaluation.

Considering the avocational and other personal interests and activities you described earlier, to what extent has your undergraduate background in sociology been important to your personal development.

☐ Very important ☐ Moderately unimportant
☐ Moderately important ☐ Very unimportant

Briefly describe the reason(s) for this evaluation.

Based on your own experience, please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 each of the following items as possible outcomes of your sociology major. A rating of 1 means that the item was an unimportant outcome of your sociology major. A rating of 5 means that the item was a very important outcome of your sociology major. Feel free to add outcomes at the end of the list that you think should be on it.

Please circle the appropriate number for each item on the list.

(1 = unimportant outcome 5 = very important outcome)

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Learned how to address issues sociologically |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Gained better understanding of myself and others |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Gained better understanding of human societies |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Could evaluate competing sociological theories |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Improved research and data analysis skills |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Completed a piece of sociological research |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Prepared for graduate or professional school |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Developed job related skills and insights |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Increased analytical and interpretive skills |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Enhanced verbal and written expression |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Other outcome: _____ |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Other outcome: _____ |

Strengths and Weaknesses of Sociology Concentration

Based on your own experience, please rate each of the following items as a strength or a weakness of the sociology major at William and Mary. Feel free to add items at the end of the list that you think should be on it.

Strength	Weakness	Uncertain	Dimension of Program
[]	[]	[]	Overall curriculum
[]	[]	[]	Core requirements (theory, methods, statistics)
[]	[]	[]	Independent research opportunities
[]	[]	[]	Faculty
[]	[]	[]	Classroom instruction
[]	[]	[]	Faculty assistance outside of classroom
[]	[]	[]	Participation in faculty research
[]	[]	[]	Career preparation
[]	[]	[]	Preparation for graduate school
[]	[]	[]	Extra-curricular activities
[]	[]	[]	Department facilities
[]	[]	[]	Other: _____
[]	[]	[]	Other: _____

From your experience, how would you rate the sociology undergraduate program at William and Mary?

- | | |
|---------------|----------------|
| [] Excellent | Comment: _____ |
| [] Good | _____ |
| [] Fair | _____ |
| [] Poor | _____ |

If you had it to do over again, would you have concentrated in sociology?

- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| [] Definitely would | Comment: _____ |
| [] Probably would | _____ |
| [] Probably would not | _____ |
| [] Definitely would not | _____ |

What suggestions would you offer for improving the undergraduate major in sociology at William and Mary?

Thank you very much.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- National Opinion Research Center. "Occupational Classification Distributions". General Social Surveys, 1972-1988: Cumulative Codebook. (1988) 619-645
- Bose, Christine E. Jobs and Gender. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1985.
- England, Paula. "Women and Occupational Prestige: A Case of 'Vacuous Sex Equality.'" Signs vol. 5 no 2 (1979): 252-65.
- Gross, Edward. "Plus Ca Change...? The Sexual Structure of Occupations Over Time." Social Problems 16 (1968): 198-208.
- Guppy, Neil and John C. Goyder. "Consensus on Occupational Prestige: A Reassessment of the Evidence." Social Forces March 1984: 709-25.
- Hall, Richard H. Occupations and the Social Structure. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc, 1969.
- Hodge, Robert W., Paul M. Siegel and Peter H. Rossi. "Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-63." American Journal of Sociology Nov. 1964: 286-302.
- Jacobs, Jerry A. Revolving Doors. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989.
- Larwood, Laurie and Barbara A. Gutek. "Women at Work in the USA." Working Women. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984.
- McClendon, McKee J. "The Occupational Status Attainment Processes of Males and Females." American Sociological Review 41 (1976): 52-64.
- Powell, Brian and Jerry A. Jacobs. "Occupational Prestige: A Sex-Neutral Concept." Sex Roles vol.12 nos.9/10 (1985): 1061-71
- Reskin, Barbara F. and Heidi I. Hartmann, eds. Women's Work Men's Work: Sex Segregation on the Job. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1986.
- Roos, Patricia A. Gender & Work: A Comparative Analysis of Industrial Societies. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985

- Steflre, Buford, Arthur Resnikoff and Lawrence Lezotte.
"The Relationship of Sex to Occupational Prestige."
Personnel and Guidance Journal April 1968: 765-72.
- Sewell, William H., Robert M. Hauser and Wendy C. Wolf.
"Sex, Schooling, and Occupational Status." American
Journal of Sociology Nov. 1980: 551-83.
- Taylor, Lee. Occupational Sociology. New York: Oxford
University Press, 1968.
- Treiman, Donald J. and Kermit Terrell. "Sex and the Process
of Status Attainment: A Comparison of Working Women and
Men." American Sociological Review 40 (1975A): 174-200.
- Treiman, Donald J. and Kermit Terrell. " Women, Work, and
Wages- Trends in the Female Occupation Structure."
Social Indicator Models. New York: Russell Sage
Foundation, 1975B.

VITA

Bonnie Lynn Reenstra

Born in Tullahoma, Tennessee, September 12, 1967.
Graduated from Hawthorne High School in Hawthorne, New
Jersey, 1985; B.A. College of William and Mary in Virginia,
1989 with a concentration in Anthropology; M.A. in Sociology
from the College of William and Mary in Virginia, 1990.